VOL. 11, NO. 3 JULY 22, 1961

NATIONAL REVIEW

Bulletin

The Newburgh Plan p. 1

Right Still Up pp. 3, 5

Deutscher's Double Fraud p. 7

EDITOR: William F. Buckley Jr. PUBLISHER: William A. Rusher
EDITORS: L. Brent Bozell, James Burnham, Frank S. Meyer, Willmoore Kendall
MANAGING EDITOR: Priscilla L. Buckley

There is no disputing the verdict. It has been pronounced by the highest jurisdiction. "Newburgh," reads the opinion (delivered as the lead editorial in the *New York Times*, 11 July), "is flagrantly, willfully in the wrong on two counts: it is pursuing an inhumane policy and it is following an outlaw course."

In their lèse majesté ("A crime committed against the sovereign power"—Webster) Newburgh's City Manager Joseph McD. Mitchell, and the City Council admit that they acted with full premeditation and aforethought. They have (again in Webster's language) "violated the dignity of the sovereign," of the centralized, bureaucratized, welfare state. Their conduct can be neither condoned nor forgiven.

What are the specifics of their crime? "The basic issue," in Mr. Mitchell's confession, "is one of home rule *vs.* state and federal control. . . . Can a city control its own social and economic future, or shall this future be determined by outsiders, by the state and federal government, by social theorists and philosophers?"

To Newburgh—a pleasant, active town of 30,000 on the west bank of the Hudson River, 60 miles north of New York—control of its own future meant the right to take steps to stop a blight of decay, disease and immorality that was spreading from a center of infection along the waterfront. Careful examination proved that one virulent source of this blight was the federal- and state-imposed relief system. This system not only piled a burden on the city budget (one-third of the total) so staggering as to prohibit positive measures for renewal, it also operated in practice to transform "living on relief" into a recognized career; and giving birth to bastards—each of whom meant by the rules a new bonus in relief payments—into a lucrative profession.

The Newburgh relief rolls had been filling with strangers who arrived not with any prospect or intention of getting a local job, but to latch on to the easy handouts. The word had gone out that Newburgh was a soft touch.

So Mr. Mitchell issued his Declaration of Independence: Thirteen Points, plain and simple. All able-bodied males on relief to go on a forty-hour work week for the city; no one to get relief who refuses employment or voluntarily quits a job without due cause; no family on relief to get more money than the take-home pay of the lowest-paid city employees; all mothers of illegitimate children to be advised that, should they have any more children out of wedlock, they shall be denied relief. . . .

Then the storm broke—from both directions, for the winds of wrath from the professional welfarists of the state and federal bureaucracy were matched by the blasts of support that blew in, and keep blowing, from thousands of beleaguered communities throughout the nation. "Now," Mr. Mitchell took note, "this list of 13 points has unintentionally attracted national interest. This national interest is of no real concern to us, as we have no use for it. Its ultimate result, however, might well be to cause a change in thinking on the state and national level, and a re-appraisal of the true role of the welfare programs. . ."

Might be; might well be.

The WEEK

● A young man from Chicago, in a moment of pique and irritation, telegraphed President Kennedy: "Have mother locked in attic and father in the basement. Send tractor." For which lighthearted exercise of freedom of speech he was: summoned by the Secret Service; interrogated as to his "intention" in sending the telegram; ordered to address six envelopes (three in printing, three in script); released with the warning that the incident would be "part of his permanent record." JFK had not been amused. (Wipe that smile off your face, citizen.)

● New York Democrats have at least three men from whom to pick their candidate for the mayoralty race: incumbent Mayor Robert Wagner (supported by Herbert Lehman, Eleanor Roosevelt); incumbent Controller Lawrence Gerosa; and State Controller Arthur Levitt (backed by Carmine De Sapio, Tammany Hall, and the Democratic leaders of Brooklyn, the Bronx, Staten Island, and Queens). The Kennedy Administration, applying its foreign policy to so hot a domestic issue, has tiptoed away and disappeared. Pudgy, listless Mayor Wagner,

whose administration has suffered from a series of investigations that have exposed blatant and flagitious corruption in virtually every department of the city government, claims that the Tammany forces opposing him are an assault on decent, honest government. Wrong premise, right conclusion. No wonder the White House keeps its hands off.

● Senator Karl Mundt, commenting on the Treasury Department's plan to print dollar bills in various colors, according to their denomination: "Some people are old-fashioned enough to believe that a better activity for government would be to design a few new ways to cut down spending, and to completely remove the red from our fiscal affairs in order to give all our dollars true blue purchasing power."



Tarentel Press

● For your memory book: Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, seven months ago: "What is being built in Cuba is, of course, a socialist economy. But this may be a necessity. In many areas of the world it is a necessity, and more than likely it must be a necessity in many South and Central American countries. Communal living does not necessarily mean an acceptance of the Soviet Communist doctrine."

● President de Gaulle gave his solemn estimate of the gravity of the international crisis approaching over the Berlin issue: "France is menaced, like all of the Free World, by a certain bloc in the East which is full of ambition and pretension, not in the depths of the people who compose it, but in the minds of its leaders. Do they want peace or do they want war? Perhaps in the near future things will be clarified. If the country were divided, the storm would break quickly. I say the same to the Free World, where the countries composing it must be in solidarity for the better and for the worse."

● In Detroit last week, Dusan Vorkapich, an AFL-CIO business agent, was charged with assault and battery, and accused of beating up Ralph W. Allen, supervisor of a firm being picketed in a dispute over union recognition. Recorder's (Criminal) Court Judge John A. Ricca dismissed all charges, declaring: "I'm not even going to question the defendant. If people want to force their way through a picket line, they have to take the consequences."

● U.S. Narcotics Commissioner Harry Anslinger declared himself "aghast" that this year's annual United Nations report on illicit narcotics traffic omits mention of Red China. "Communist China is responsible for 65% of the world's traffic," Anslinger stated. In every prior year's report since the UN's founding, Communist China's name has, percentage-wise, led all the rest. Could it be that Dag Hammarskjold felt it would be indelicate to gossip about someone he hopes to welcome this autumn as a member of the family?

● Gina Lollobrigida was tired. Her hair in more of a rat's nest than even today's fashion requires. Blue linen suit a crumpled disaster after long hours on a plane. But the minute she landed it was hurry, hurry, hurry. No time to change or freshen up. The reception's on now. Everyone's waiting. Let's go; and there she was, in the third row of a Soviet auditorium, condemned to listen to a 45-minute harangue by Soviet Culture Minister Ekaterina Furtseva (no beauty queen she) on the glories of Soviet Russia, of Comrade Khrushchev (who listened with satisfaction), of the Soviet film industry, of everything in short but Gina. It was too much. La Lollobrigida is Italian (and therefore temperamental), a movie star (and therefore temperamental), a beautiful woman (and therefore temperamental), so she took a walk—and, incidentally stole the show (and $100,000 worth of publicity). What our State Department couldn't do with talent like that!

● The bureaucracy that sets prices for wheat, corn, tobacco, cotton, airline tickets, freight rates, milk, phone calls, minimum wages, depletion, depreciation, expense accounts, and a few thousand other items has declared its High and Noble Purpose of abolishing price-fixing in private industry. After all, shouldn't the government do what the people can't do for themselves?

● It will cost $9,000 a year to train and maintain each Peace Corps overseas volunteer, according to an itemized breakdown made public by Peace Corps headquarters. The Papal Volunteers for Latin America, a project similar to the Peace Corps, trains volunteers, sends them to and from Latin America, and supports them while there, for a total cost per person—for *three* years—of $2,860.

● The news is out of Whittaker Chambers' death. No man's death would more greatly have moved the staff of NATIONAL REVIEW, for we were his colleagues in the broadest sense, had been his colleagues in the narrower sense during the two years that he worked here; and we were his admirers, his debtors for having learned so much from him, his devoted friends.

A Broken Reed to Lean On

Day after day spokesmen for the Administration state that they have got to "explain to the country" the reality of the danger from the Berlin crisis, and "arouse the people" to the needs for unflinching counter-action to Khrushchev's threats. There are many indications that "the country" and "the people" are considerably more aroused and unflinching than their mentors, and that the White House professors might do best to make themselves their first pupils.

On July 10 Secretary of State Dean Rusk gave a speech to the National Press Club that was a perplexing emulsion: half clear reasoning, and half oily confusion. "The central issue of the crisis," he stated clearly, "is the announced determination to impose a world of coercion upon those not already subjected to it. It is posed between the Sino-Soviet empire and all the rest, whether allied or neutral; and it is now posed in every continent."

But he then poured an oily UN admixture. "It is essential to get on with the building of the world community designed by the [UN] Charter. . . . In the United Nations, commitments to the Charter can weave the fabric of common interest [and in the UN] we must throw ourselves into the building of a decent world order." The problem of Berlin (he added in reply to questions) might be taken to the UN "at some stage."

But what conceivable good could the UN do in relation to the Berlin problem, and the war crisis that it poses, when the empire with "the announced determination to impose a world of coercion" is an integral and essential element of the UN?

Would it be indiscreet to suggest that there was a good deal more common sense, and more dignity, in what Nikita Khrushchev had to say on the subject of the UN, a day later:

"Even if all countries of the world adopted a decision which did not accord with the interests of the Soviet Union and threatened its security, the Soviet Union would not recognize such a decision, but would uphold its rights, relying on force. . . . The same thing would be done by any state which loves freedom, respects its independence and is able to uphold it."

Canute's Broom

The press struggled mightily to convince us that the Virginia primaries posed a serious test for the regime of Senator Harry Byrd, that traditional conservatism could not stand up in the fresh wind of the New Frontier. Tens of thousands of newly registered èmigrès from Washington and native Negroes guided by the NAACP would repudiate the Byrd forces, which would disintegrate under the issues of school segregation and machine politics. Ticket-splitting would kill Byrd's men. On the Sunday before the election, the Washington, Baltimore and New York City press described the weakness of the

PEOPLE: Latest **Richard Nixon** position as he consolidates control of California organization: I am not *now* a candidate for governor in 1962; my decision will be made within 60 days. Reason for acknowledgement that he may be (read it: is) candidate: a reliable San Francisco polling outfit reported Nixon's California voter appeal now well ahead of **Pat Brown's**. (Gov. Brown also trailed former GOP Gov. **Goodwin Knight**, former Sen. **William Knowland**.) . . . GOP strategists believe they'll win New Jersey gubernatorial election this year, expect large segments of organized labor to support former Labor Secretary **James Mitchell**. . . . Oregon labor, from all reports, has been wooed and won by Republican Gov. **Mark Hatfield's** legislative program and is expected to support him next year. . . . **Nelson Rockefeller** said to be totally disenchanted by antics of Sen. **Jacob Javits**, who engineered big publicity build-up as possible GOP opponent to Mayor **Wagner**, then withdrew. . . . Rockefeller aides watching with alarm growing political cosiness of Javits and Senate colleague **Clifford Case** (R., N.J.) whose Presidential aspirations Nelson views with distrust. . . . The June 30 editorial in *Life*, favorable cover story in *Time* raise query: Is **Luce** organization hoping to take over **Barry Goldwater?** (The answer: tell only will time?)

Persistent rumors from Havana indicate new shakeup may be in making in **Castro** government, with President **Dorticós** possibly replaced by **Salvador García Agüero**, Communist Party member. . . . Brazilian legislator **Athos Viera de Andrade**, member of a government delegation invited to Cuba by Castro, returned a rabid anti-Fidelista. He has launched campaign "to enlighten his countrymen on what is really going on in Cuba." . . . Brazilian Pres. **Quadros** last week ordered radio, TV stations to give Brazilian tunes equal time with foreign records. . . . Italian President **Gronchi**, considered a leftist when elected, recently under bitter attack by **Nenni's** fellow-traveling Socialists for "rightist deviations." . . . Family plan on the Adriatic: fifteen of 40 members of Albanian Communist Committee are related to strongman **Hoxha**. . . . Unkindest cut of all: since breakdown of Prisoners for Tractors negotiations, Radio Havana has been attacking **Walter Reuther** as the "servant of Yankee monopolists." . . . Rep. **Victor Anfuso** (D., N.Y.) agitating in Congress for U.S. recognition of a Cuban government-in-exile.

The *Evening News*, official organ of **Kwame Nkrumah's** Convention People's Party, reports an important discovery: **Beethoven** and **Haydn**, it seems, were really Negroes "who have been falsely described as members of the white race."

Byrd forces in articles that sounded like a valediction, if not a funeral oration.

Two days later the Byrd candidates swamped the opposition. In a vote approaching in size the 1952 record for a Democratic primary, without noticeable signs of ticket-splitting, the entire list of candidates identified with the conservative politics of Senator Byrd was accepted by the party. Three lessons may be drawn: 1) the conservative movement, symbolized by the sparkling victory of John Tower in Texas, is not merely local, but national; 2) it is not moribund, but blooming; 3) the solipsistic Liberal press cannot halt the movement by reporting its demise, any more than King Canute could sweep back the tides of the ocean.

Sanctuary by Default

Jimmy Hoffa, brother of a small-time hoodlum, snapped up the Teamsters Union after Dave Beck, a convicted big-time hoodlum, went to jail. In the next four years Jimmy Hoffa talked back to Presidents, wised off at Senate investigators, sneered at Cabinet members, overruled the courts, shrugged off the court-appointed monitors, beat a bribery rap, and declared war on the merged labor movement (calling George Meany of the AFL-CIO "that dopey, thick-headed Irishman"). He and his Teamsters were tossed out of the AFL-CIO for violation of its ethical code. His lieutenants parried six indictments for unethical practice, and the Justice Department seems to be dropping its plan to prosecute him for a shady Florida real estate deal.

Last week, by acclamation, the delegates to Jimmy Hoffa's convention 1) revised the constitution (of the Teamsters, not yet of the United States of America) to permit racketeers to hold membership; 2) widened the union's scope to include all workers in all fields everywhere; 3) tossed out a proposal for secret balloting, calling it a "foreign system" and blasting as a "yellow-bellied bum" anyone who wouldn't stand up and be counted; 4) increased the membership dues by $12 million a year; 5) approved all actions of all union officers in the last four years; 6) elected Jimmy Hoffa to a five-year term as president; 7) raised his salary from $50,000 a year to $75,000 B. E. (before expenses). Jimmy Hoffa announced that he'd take over the AFL-CIO, and declared his eternal opposition to any ethical codes. "I may have faults," said Jimmy Hoffa, "but being wrong ain't one of them."

As this swelling bullfrog moves ever closer to complete control of all transport in this country, one wonders: Where is the government that exists to shield the people against unwarranted accumulations of anti-social power? The answer is that the government, absorbed in its humanitarian programs to buy crops, give away food, build apartments, run railroads, remake the educational system, provide medical care, relocate industries, reform morals and reorganize racial relations, no longer

• At Home •

Rover Boys at Play

Washington

Those fun-loving rover boys, the dunking Kennedys, have sent a shiver of dismay through the less irresponsible members of Washington officialdom. For while Attorney General Bobby pushed a dinner-jacketed Ted into the swimming pool of his Virginia home, was in turn treated to a gay immersion, and then watched Ted shove Presidential Press Secretary Pierre Salinger into the midnight waters, the grown-up world was not deflected by those alcoholic high jinks and moved inexorably toward tragedy on a global scale. The President ("ole rocking chair's got him") may have privately admonished the Kennedy young fry that their oopsy-woopsy was perhaps unseemly, but as of this writing he has made no public protest. The realization that he has filled the seats of the mighty with adolescents apparently has penetrated about as little as any recognition by him that he is delivering the free world piecemeal to the Communist brigands.

This lack of understanding, in a man who is still being touted by many Liberals as a combination Washington-Jefferson-Lincoln-FDR, is what gives many in the capital the galloping creeps. In less than six months, Mr. Kennedy has apathetically surrendered the nation's foreign policy to the all-out appeasers. Secretary of State Dean Rusk speaks soberly of the threat to the nation. But in the privacy of the State Department he has accepted every program suggested by the "peace at all costs" middle echelon.

It is a secret only to readers of the *Washington Post* that Ambassador Adlai Stevenson has nodded approvingly to the efforts of the "neutralist" bloc to bring Red China into the United Nations. Mr. Stevenson, in fact, has suggested to those who since 1949 have lived for this eventuality that if the Chinese Communist regime is admitted via the Credentials Committee ("accept those of Red China, do not honor those of the Nationalists on Taiwan"), the veto will not be applicable. The Kennedy Administration can then throw up its hands in feigned chagrin and say, "But what could we do?"

To Senator John Tower, from the Republican leadership in Congress: three choice committee assignments—Labor and Public Welfare, Banking and Currency, and Senate Republican Policy. Texas Republicans, their appetite whetted by Tower's triumph and reward, are plotting now to capture five or six congressional seats, to give Bruce Alger, Texas' lone Republican congressman, some

companionship in the House. A San Antonio district, where there will be a special election this autumn to fill a vacancy, looks like a good first bet. The Democratic vote will probably be split among several candidates, opening a path for a one-shot Republican entry. At the 1962 regular elections, the Texas GOP thinks it can round up another four or five prizes, mostly in the big-city areas that are the local Republcian strongholds.

The Administration's war on business—and its loud outcry that a depression could be averted only by massive government spending—has not prevented Seymour Wolfbein, head of the Bureau of Labor Statistics and one of the many holdovers from the Truman Administration, from boasting of the upturn in employment as if it were something that God and President Kennedy had wrought.

The Labor Department, however, continues to cry havoc over the "rise" in unemployment. The statistics issued by Mr. Wolfbein show that employment increased by about two million—and that factory employment, the soft spot in the economy, increased by more than twice the seasonal gain. Unemployment "jumped" by 800,000, according to the BLS. But that figure is as fraudulent as all the statistical tables which a conscienceless Labor Department has foisted on the nation. A substantial part of it is made up of college and high school students looking for jobs as summer soda jerks, parking lot attendants, etc. When the fall semester begins, they will be back at the books—and what passes for education nowadays. What the Kennedy Administration refuses to admit is that the economy is adjusting to the rise and fall of the market—without benefit of clergy or the Harvard eggheads who surround Mr. Kennedy.

"The U.S. economy is now set on a course that will carry it to a boom this year and a superboom before the end of 1962," says *Fortune*. "The base of the business recovery continues to broaden," says First National City Bank in its July "Letter." "The recovery now in the making, in other words, should carry the economy to a general state of prosperity and high-level employment during 1962," says Morgan Guaranty Trust Company in its June "Survey." "Extended Boom Lies Ahead," runs the title of Standard & Poor's business forecast published June 12. Virtually every economic forecaster now shares the Kennedy Administration's visions of a steady ascent to some future Parnassus of splendid and sumptuous material wealth. Such forecasts are always open to question. But one cannot deny their dreamlike unanimity. Is this the same country—sick, stagnant, hungry, ill-housed—that a young man stumped last year on his way to the Presidency?

QUINCY

has time or interest to give to the original reasons for its existence. A government of a free people exists to protect the individual against power abused. If a government can no longer do so, or does not, it loses its legitimate claim on the loyalty of the citizens.

Our government, by default, has granted Jimmy Hoffa a sanctuary from which he can raid the commonwealth. It is now Jimmy Hoffa *vs.* The People. The People have their faults, too, and we shall soon see if being wrong ain't one of them.

BRIEFS: Musical chairs: Sen. Dirksen giving up his seat on Senate Labor Committee to the new Star of Texas, John G. Tower; Sen. Fong (Hawaii) resigning from Interior Committee to make way for Dirksen; Fong to get ex-Sen. Blakley's seat on Judiciary Committee. Net result: Liberal wing of Judiciary Committee strengthened since Republican Fong is more Liberal than Democrat Blakley. . . . Teamster convention gave Jimmy Hoffa blank check to set up largest lobby of them all in Washington. . . . DRIVE, the Teamster version of the AFL-CIO's COPE, gained 70,000 dues-paying ($1 a year) members in '60. . . . **American Civil Liberties Union will support Communist petition for rehearing of Supreme Court decision ordering the Party to register as agent of foreign power.** . . . Example of A. A. Berle's exit from Washington scene expected to be followed by another White House aide before autumn. . . . John Birch Society nearing 150,000 members. . . . In three days following its blast at Robert Welch, *Los Angeles Times* lost 8,000 subscribers. . . . Certain members of John Birch Society Council unhappy over new Society program to assemble lists of Communists, Socialists and Liberals (do-it-yourself blacklists?).

Farm problems in Communist world: East Germany now rationing butter, meat, other staples. . . . Russian meat production down 13% in first quarter of '61. . . . **Red China lifting all restrictions on amount of food its residents can receive from abroad.** . . . The Red Chinese yuan (official exchange value 2.40 yuan to $1) now quoted at 7.04 in Southeast Asia capitals. . . . Japanese Communist Party, which holds its eighth Congress July 25, will put heavy stress on united front tactics. . . . The Greek press reports Bulgaria has agreed to resettle 25,000 Greek Communists, who have been living in Poland since end of crucial civil war in early '50's, along the Greek border.

Delta's new Atlanta to Las Vegas flight called: Flight 7-11.

NATIONAL REVIEW is published weekly by National Review, Inc., at 440 Post Road, Orange, Conn. (second class mail privileges authorized at Orange, Conn.). Copyright 1961 in the U.S.A., by National Review, Inc. All manuscripts, letters subscription orders, changes of address and undeliverable copies should be sent to:

EDITORIAL AND CIRCULATION OFFICES
National Review
150 East 35th St., New York 16, N.Y.
Telephone ORegon 9-7330

RATES: $15.00 a year ($8.00 for the 32-page issues, and $7.00 for the 8-page issues published on the alternate fortnight). The 8-page issues are available separately at $10.00 a year. In all cases, add $1.00 for Canada, $2.00 for other foreign subscriptions.

• Trends •

Among many appalling developments in American politics, none is more ominous than the growth of the Executive branch of the Federal Government.

As James Burnham observes, the Executive has become all but omnipotent, to the point where it will "call on Congress to vote appropriations for foreign aid, but will decline to furnish information about what has been, is being and is intended to be done with foreign aid."

As the example suggests, the key to Executive ascendancy, and to the decline of Congress, is our government's increasing involvement in foreign affairs, in which the President and his corps of diplomatic functionaries have taken the lead. In wartime, particularly, our Presidents have assumed vast powers, and have not always relinquished the substance of them when peace ensued. These powers have encompassed domestic as well as foreign matters, so that now, instead of the President's ratifying action taken by Congress, we find Congress dutifully awaiting the President's "program"—on foreign aid, schools, agriculture, housing and what have you.

This trend is of course promoted and acclaimed by those employed in the Executive branch and by Liberal Bonapartists like Clinton Rossiter and Walter Lippmann, and it is unthinkingly accepted by much of the American public. The real measure of our distress, however, is the degree to which Congress itself has embraced the theory of Presidential omnipotence, and has obligingly performed as welcome mat for anything and everything proposed by the White House.

I recently chanced across a striking example of this submissiveness emanating from the office of Senator Vance Hartke, Democrat of Indiana. Hartke represents a state notorious for its self-reliance, and historically distrustful of centralized government. He is, moreover, chairman of the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee. It is his job to assist Democrats eager to ascend to the exalted rank of U.S. Senator. But Hartke apparently does not consider that his position as a Senator allows him any independence of action.

Such, at least, are the views implicit in a form letter he is currently mailing to some of his constituents. Two Indiana voters recently wrote the Senator concerning important matters of American foreign policy—the antics of United Nations Ambassador Adlai Stevenson, and a resolution urging America to declare war on international Communism, submitted by Rep. Donald Bruce (R.-Ind.).

Senator Hartke's response was instructive, first of all, in that it suggested he did not believe either matter very significant—since he answered both with a canned response irrevelant to the specific subject at hand. It was even more instructive, however, in the opinions it expressed concerning the respective roles of the President and the Congress.

"As you know," Hartke wrote, "according to our Constitution, the President is the chief architect of our foreign policy and for this reason he must direct our actions abroad. Our new Administration has initiated several new programs designed to increase the effectiveness of our efforts in the cold war. Among these are the Food for Peace program, the Peace Corps, and a revamped foreign policy in many areas.

"*It is the duty of Congress to implement the policies of the President*, and you may be assured that he will continue to have the whole-hearted support of Congress in his efforts to find solutions to the many problems confronting our nation." (Italics added.)

We may grant that, as a Democrat, Hartke is constrained to agree as often as possible with the Democratic President. But he could do that simply by saying that he, Hartke, in his capacity as a United States Senator, had decided the programs were proper and necessary, and therefore supports them. But this is not his position; it is all up to the President, in Hartke's view, and whatever the President decides, Congress has the "duty" to "implement."

The "duty" Hartke imputes to Congress would, I think, have been vehemently contested by the men who drafted the American Constitution. In that document, Congress is given original power to regulate foreign commerce, to punish piracies and "offences against the law of nations," to declare war, "to make rules concerning captures on land and water," "to raise and support armies," "to provide and maintain a navy," and to provide for militia action "to repel invasions."

Even in the business of diplomacy, the President needs congressional approval to execute treaties with foreign nations, and to appoint ambassadors and other diplomatic functionaries. Indeed, the Constitution gives Congress the power, if it wishes, to vest the power to appoint secondary diplomatic officers, not in the President, but "in the courts of law, or in the heads of departments."

If Congress was intended to have all these powers, is it conceivable that the Constitution means it to stand meekly by, accepting whatever foreign policy the President lays down, with never a murmur of protest? In foreign matters, as in domestic, the Founding Fathers obviously conceived the President as the officer who executed the policy and the program created by Congress. Senator Hartke, in his statement that Congress is constitutionally enjoined to "implement" whatever the President devises, has matters completely reversed.

As Prof. Clinton Rossiter has observed, the Presidency today is by far the most powerful branch of the Federal Government, ranging well beyond the intentions of the founders: "It cuts deeply into the powers of Congress; in fact it has quite reversed the expectations of the framers by becoming itself a vortex into which these powers have been drawn in massive amounts."

As long as the Senate of the United States is populated by such as Vance Hartke, we may be assured, those powers will be bled from Congress in ever more massive proportions.

M. Stanton Evans

• Abroad •

Geneva. The spectacular success of the latest operation of their "disinformation branch" has astonished even the directors of the Communist *apparat*. The Kremlin's forgery shop wrote up a brochure purporting to be a fierce attack on the Chinese Communists. Early in June, this was leaked quietly by publication—as allegedly an anonymous document currently circulating inside the Russian Communist Party—in an obscure, insignificant French journal, *La Voie Communiste* ("The Communist Way") of Trotskyite-Titoist tendency. There it aroused no public notice, and the project was all but written off as stillborn. Then suddenly, one month later, the forgery reappeared, in "English translation," with all the trappings of an international sensation: full text in the *London Times*, *Washington Post*, etc. and headlined front page articles in the *New York Times* (July 6). This time its well-paid impresario was "the Russian expert" who has so often done so much in aid and comfort of Moscow: Isaac Deutscher, who, perpetrating a double fraud, omitted any mention of the prior publication, and invented the authorship of Khrushchev and a mysterious source of his own.

Warwick, England. Many of the great homes of England have managed to keep going by opening their grounds and principal rooms to the public, on certain days a week, for a fee. The Duke of Bedford has been the envy of his peers for his unexpected talents as showman: he collected visitors and pounds by the thousands, by adding to the historic treasures of his estate, a zoo, merry-go-round, café, bar and children's games. This year, however, the Marquis of Hertford, at his seat of Ragley Hall in nearby Warwickshire, may outdo Bedford. The Marquis, known locally as "the floating peer," loves to water ski. He decided to put on a display of his prowess on his own ten acre lake, for the edification of the paying guests. But the day was windy, and he twice fell and went under. The crowd loved it. Now he is giving regular performances featuring falls done on purpose.

Paris. The weekly *Paris-Match* offers the following "summary of any play by Tennessee Williams": "A son is in love with his mother, and becomes disconsolate on discovering that he is an orphan."

Budapest. As in most of Europe, organized gambling flourished legally in the East European nations before the war. When the Communists took over, they at first suppressed all gambling on ideological grounds, as a crass expression of "speculation," incompatible with socialist norms. A survey published by *East Europe* shows that in the past few years, legal gambling has been revived on a large scale. The main types are sports (especially soccer) pools and state lotteries (usually called "Lotto" or "Toto-Lotek"). Besides cash prizes, players can win autos, apartments, TVs, vacation trips, etc. The governmental motives in sponsoring these operations are twofold: to give people an outlet for venturesome and acquisitive impulses; and—through the heavy take that is sliced off—to raise money in a way that no one objects to.



©*Punch*, Ben Roth

England Faces the Common Market

"If these European blighters want us so badly why can't they do the decent thing and join the Commonwealth?"

Peiping. The agricultural crisis continues unabated, and prospects for this year's harvest give little chance for improvement. Russia has no surplus to spare. The huge imports of Canadian and Australian grain are assigned to the army. Approximately 20 million town dwellers have been sent to work in the countryside. The official press declares ten-year-old children fit for clearing weeds, watching oxen and rearing pigs. Appeals are made to the youth to give up high school for farm work. Heavy losses of draught animals have brought widespread use of human beings for plowing and harrowing. In guarded language, the press is beginning to raise questions about the lost "incentives" and "motives" for labor.

London. A recent contest in *New Statesman* called for a quatrain on some contemporary political tendency in the style of a 19th century definition by Ebenezer Elliott:

> What is a communist? One who hath yearnings
> For equal division of unequal earnings.
> Be he idler or bungler or both he is willing
> To fork out his sixpence and pocket your shilling.

One of the prizewinners thus sings of "the Bow Group," an influential tendency within the Conservative Party whose similarity with a certain section of the Republican Party will not escape American readers:

> What's the Bow Group? A committee that aims
> To give Socialist measures Conservative names.
> The Bow of their choice is a long one, a strong one.
> But the target they land on is often the wrong one.

• The Investor •

A demonstration of character in the way in which a company's management conducts its business has become increasingly crucial in the national managerial struggle and should be of paramount interest to the investor.

In the early 1940s, James Burnham's *The Managerial Revolution* pointed up the struggle for power dominance in determining the nation's future. Engaged in this competition were the political managers, the labor managers, and the business managers. Since that time, none of these groups has emerged as the undisputed winner, but there has been a distinct shift in power. The political managers have made the greatest progress; labor has enhanced its power while business managers have lost ground.

The battle continues. It is of utmost importance to investors and consumer alike that the power position of the business leaders be not further eroded; it would in fact be highly salutary if the power of labor and of the political managers could be reduced.

The greatest force in shifting power between the three groups is public confidence and belief in integrity of action and motives.

The Attorney General's recent demand that the electrical manufacturers sign a consent decree is obviously a move to increase federal power over business leaders. The Justice Department has threatened to sue for the dismemberment of any company which refuses to agree in advance not to sell its products at "unreasonably low" prices. No definition is attempted as to what constitutes "unreasonably low" prices. This puts the manufacturer in the position of speculating on what the Justice Department's opinion will be today and how it may shift with a change in Department personnel or in the prevailing political wind. The Justice Department took advantage of the recent conviction of the leaders in the electrical industry on price-fixing charges to press for further—and many believe—unjustified controls over the setting of prices by the industry.

With no laws to guide it, each company is required to prove any time, at the Department's request, that its prices are not "unreasonably low." So the company can be assumed to be guilty until it proves itself innocent —while not knowing what constitutes being guilty or innocent.

The effect of signing such a consent decree is for a company to put its head in a noose. The Attorney General, with the consent decree in hand, could engage in harassment tactics, any time he chose, and for whatever purpose, political as well as any other. Thus, vastly more power over one area of business would be lodged in the hands of the political managers.

What induced most of the electrical manufacturers to agree to such a decree is conjectural. They may have feared that prolonged legal action against them by Washington would further injure their corporate image and thereby lose for them public goodwill. They may have wished to avoid a costly legal fight and to avert dismemberment, which they guessed public opinion might now support. It is also possible that they were willing to let the industry leader fight their battle, knowing that anything it gained would also apply to them. If the latter were a motive, we need a change in the top leadership of most electrical manufacturing companies.

The General Electric Co., in its rejection of the government's demand for a consent decree, has earned the position of number one citizen of its industry. It has taken a place in the front rank among the corporate greats of our country. And it deserves the wholehearted support of every investor and of every individual.

General Electric determined not to knuckle under in a central government power grab, but to take its stand on principle and fight it through. The issue is clear-cut.

In the background, egging on the Department of Justice, are the labor managers embittered by the outstanding success achieved by GE's "Boulwarism" labor policies over the past decade. (The name is derived from the name of the GE vice-president who instituted the program.) The present Administration was elected with the support of most labor leaders. The Justice Department is hardly likely to ignore their demands.

I have discussed Boulwarism at length in the past. Its cardinal tenet is a continuous education program aimed at demonstrating to employees where their best interests lie. Labor leaders, by and large, have encouraged members to think that employee and management interests are diametrically opposed and that all blessings flow from union leaders.

Boulwarism, for years derided by corporation executives specializing in labor relations, has proved itself sufficiently compelling to become a growing threat to labor leaders' irresponsible exercise of power.

Were I a GE salesman of electric generating equipment, I would quit if I couldn't sell private utilities on doing business with GE. The private electrical utilities have their own fight to prevent encroachment of government power, whether by tax-free public authorities or tax-free rural electrification associations.

I believe that General Electric's loss of public esteem, due to the conspiracy proceedings, has reached its lowest point. General Electric has now taken a stand on principle which I am convinced will be supported overwhelmingly by the public. It is the basic philosophy of our nation that everyone is innocent until proved guilty, and also that we govern by written laws passed by legally-chosen legislators, and not by the changing whims of administrators.

Although the Attorney General would no doubt deny it, his effort to force this particular consent decree on the electrical industry is one more attempt at government by fiat.

NORVIN R. GREENE.